

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

RAGHVENDRA SINGH,

Plaintiff,

V.

SHUBHANGINI DEVINE,

Defendants.

Case No.: 1:22-cv-00061-JLT-SAB (PC)

**ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS AND DENYING  
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE  
RELIEF**

**(Docs. 17, 18)**

Plaintiff filed a motion requesting a transfer from his current place of incarceration in Delano, California, to one in Sacramento, California. (Doc. 17.) Construing the motion as one for injunctive relief, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations to deny the motion because no defendant has been served and Plaintiff has yet to state a cognizable claim for relief. (Doc. 18 at 3.) In addition, the magistrate judge determined that “Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate imminent irreparable harm necessary to support a preliminary injunction.” (*Id.* at 3-4.) Plaintiff filed objections on July 11, 2022, which largely reiterate in greater detail the reasons for his original transfer request. (Doc. 20.)

According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B), this Court conducted a *de novo* review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire matter, including Plaintiff's objections, the Court concludes the findings and recommendations are supported by the record and by proper analysis. The objections do not undermine the magistrate judge's reasoning. As the findings and recommendations correctly

1 explain, this Court does not have authority—no matter who else agrees transfer may be appropriate—  
2 to order any injunctive relief in the absence of a cognizable claim on which Plaintiff is likely to  
3 succeed. Thus, the Court **ORDERS**:

- 4 1. The findings and recommendations dated June 23, 2022 (Doc. 18) are adopted in full.
- 5 2. Plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief (Doc. 17) is denied.

6  
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: **July 15, 2022**

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE